EXHIBIT 436

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
             FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
 2.
                      EASTERN DIVISION
 3
    IN RE: NATIONAL
                            : MDL No. 2804
    PRESCRIPTION OPIATE
                             : Case No. 17-md-2804
 4
    LITIGATION
 5
    APPLIES TO ALL CASES : Hon. Dan A. Polster
 6
                    HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL
 8
 9
         SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW
10
11
12
                      DECEMBER 20, 2018
13
14
     VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF JOSEPH EDWARD MILLWARD,
15
    taken pursuant to notice, was held at Marcus &
16
    Shapira, One Oxford Center, 35th Floor, Pittsburgh,
17
    Pennsylvania 15219, by and before Ann Medis,
18
    Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in
19
    and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on
20
    Thursday, December 20, 2018, commencing at 9:07 a.m.
21
22
                 GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES
              877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
23
                       deps@golkow.com
24
25
```

- 1 investigation as it's not required.
- 2 BY MR. HUDSON:
- Q. Since you are aware of no orders of
- 4 hydrocodone combination products that were worthy
- of being flagged, you agree then there's no review
- 6 or investigation notes that we can look at to
- 7 determine what HBC did to evaluate whether or not
- 8 any of their hydrocodone combination product
- 9 shipments were at risk for diversion?
- MR. KOBRIN: Object to form. It
- 11 misrepresents the record.
- 12 THE WITNESS: Can you restate that again
- 13 a little differently?
- 14 BY MR. HUDSON:
- 15 O. Sure.
- 16 A. I just want to make sure I understand
- 17 you thoroughly.
- 18 Q. As you sit here today, are you aware of
- 19 any reviews or investigations that were done by
- 20 HBC of any orders of hydrocodone combination
- 21 products?
- 22 A. So as we looked at the -- we talked
- 23 previously and discussed at store 8 inquiring,
- sending it to the pharmacy district manager to
- 25 investigate. So I apologize for not fully

- 1 understanding the force of your question.
- Q. Other than that one, are there any other
- 3 investigations you're aware of or reviews that
- 4 occurred?
- 5 A. The orders that came up on the flag
- 6 reports would all have been reviewed.
- 7 Q. Each and every one of them?
- 8 A. To determine whether there was any
- 9 diversion or activity.
- 10 Q. So Exhibits 10 through 21 that we looked
- 11 at earlier, those reports, it's your testimony
- that each and every one of the orders that were
- 13 listed on those reports were reviewed or
- 14 investigated for risk of diversion?
- 15 A. Well, I can't recall every individual
- 16 case and I can speak to store 8 as it's been
- 17 refreshed. That information would belong to the
- 18 pharmacy district manager, pushed to them, to take
- 19 a look at. And that was before we had other
- 20 systems to be able to look into movement
- 21 centrally.
- 0. I don't understand. What does that
- 23 mean? You have those Exhibits 10 through 21. We
- talked about them earlier today. They're these
- reports. What did it mean they were pushed to the

- 1 pharmacy district managers to take a look at?
- 2 A. That's what the -- when you see the
- 3 store 8, Todd the store flagged, I believe.
- 4 Q. Are you saying you or George contacted
- 5 the pharmacy district managers?
- 6 A. To have them take a look at it, one of
- 7 us, anybody on that distribution list would have
- 8 been able to as well. But to send it to them to
- 9 say you have a store that's on the report, take a
- 10 look, tell me.
- 11 Q. Is there any reason why any of those
- 12 reviews or investigations, why there wasn't a
- process put in place to track what was being done?
- MR. KOBRIN: Object to form. Asked and
- 15 answered.
- THE WITNESS: You're asking if there was
- a procedure for recording those investigations?
- 18 BY MR. HUDSON:
- 19 Q. My question is: Is there any reason
- 20 why -- so now I'm asking about the reason -- is
- 21 there any reason why you did not put a process in
- 22 place to document in writing the reviews or
- investigations that were occurring?
- MR. KOBRIN: Object to form. Asked and
- answered.

- 1 THE WITNESS: Not a requirement.
- 2 BY MR. HUDSON:
- Q. Would you agree that it would be easier
- 4 for us to today to try to figure out what HBC did
- 5 if HBC would have documented in writing the
- 6 reviews and investigations that occurred?
- 7 MR. KOBRIN: Object to form, as you
- 8 repeatedly asked and repeatedly answered for a
- 9 long period this morning. I want that on the
- 10 record.
- 11 THE WITNESS: You're asking an "if"
- 12 question for me to speculate as to how you would
- 13 be able to see that. I don't believe I can answer
- 14 that.
- 15 BY MR. HUDSON:
- 16 Q. I'm asking: Would you agree as we sit
- here today and we're trying to figure out what
- 18 reviews or investigations occurred, other than
- 19 store 8 -- is there any other investigation you
- 20 can tell me about that occurred between November
- of 2009 and October of 2014 of hydrocodone
- 22 combination products?
- MR. KOBRIN: Object to form.
- THE WITNESS: So 2009 to October '10 I
- wasn't in the role. Beyond to where after 2013

- when, as we've established, the report was
- 2 created, then those reports and movements would
- 3 have been pushed. The only one we have
- 4 documentation of, store 8, and it's been three,
- 5 five years.
- 6 BY MR. HUDSON:
- 7 Q. Right. That's all I'm getting at. If
- 8 we had documented each review or investigation and
- 9 put those into writing, wouldn't that be easier
- 10 for us today to be trying to figure out what HBC
- 11 did between 2009 and 2014?
- MR. KOBRIN: Object to form.
- 13 THE WITNESS: As a speculation and
- 14 crystal ball looking into the magic 8 ball of
- would this be easier, that's an interesting
- 16 question.
- 17 BY MR. HUDSON:
- Q. Do you want to answer it?
- MR. KOBRIN: Object to form.
- THE WITNESS: It's hard to say. I don't
- 21 have a good -- I'm not going to speculate.
- 22 BY MR. HUDSON:
- Q. We do agree though that HBC never
- 24 blocked a single shipment of hydrocodone
- combination products during the time that it was a

- 1 distributor of those products; correct?
- A. Again, I can't speak to what happened
- 3 before I was in the role, understanding -- with
- 4 that qualifier.
- 5 Q. At least while you were there though,
- 6 you agree there was never a shipment of
- 7 hydrocodone combination products that were blocked
- 8 from shipment at HBC; correct?
- 9 A. I'm not aware of any shipment that was
- 10 blocked.
- 11 Q. You agree that during the time you were
- 12 the senior manager of compliance, there was never
- 13 a shipment of hydrocodone combination products
- 14 where you notified the DEA that they were a
- 15 suspicious order; right?
- 16 A. Again, I'm not aware that there was a
- 17 flag that was deemed to be suspicious.
- MR. HUDSON: I don't have any further
- 19 questions.
- 20 EXAMINATION
- 21 BY MR. KOBRIN:
- Q. Mr. Millward, you were asked earlier
- today about stopping shipments on orders of
- interest while they were being investigated.
- Do you recall that line of questioning?

- 1 A. I do.
- 2 O. Tell me, are there different means
- 3 through which Giant Eagle or HBC investigates an
- 4 order of interest?
- 5 A. Yes. We talked at length about the
- 6 threshold or the Voelker report, so to speak, but
- 7 there were other systems in place. Giant Eagle
- 8 invested in two tools from a company by the name
- 9 of Supply Logics.
- Supply Logics had two products, Pinpoint
- 11 Monitor and Pinpoint Audit, one looking at
- 12 pharmacy purchasing patterns, the other looking at
- 13 pharmacy dispensing patterns.
- Giant Eagle also invested in a dedicated
- 15 person to review those or to have access and
- 16 review those tools to look for any -- really as a
- 17 redundant mechanism to look for any kind of
- 18 movement of controlled substances that could
- 19 potentially be a flag for investigation.
- Q. Just to clarify the record, are there
- 21 situations where through this investigation you
- 22 could stop an order of interest before it shipped?
- 23 A. That is correct. If a report was
- 24 generated or a flag was generated, we had the
- 25 potential to stop the orders for that store until

- an investigation could be fully fleshed out.
- Q. That was if a flag was generated by the
- 3 person you had hired to do investigation --
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 Q. -- with this Supply Logic program?
- 6 A. Correct. His name was Jason Mullen.
- 7 Q. And he could do these investigations and
- 8 he could stop the shipment when that store made an
- 9 order if he found there was a reason to
- investigate that store; is that correct?
- 11 A. That is correct.
- 12 Q. Now, were there other situations in
- which you could not necessarily stop a shipment
- even after you identified an order of interest?
- 15 A. So the Kayla report was a report that
- 16 came out the next day after a store had received
- the order, and that's where that store had already
- 18 received it. So it afforded the opportunity to
- investigate at that point and stop future orders
- 20 it determined to be suspicious and then
- 21 subsequently reported as required.
- Q. Did you ever do that, stop future
- 23 orders?
- 24 A. We did.
- Q. And was there anything else you could do

- 1 even if the order had been started to be filled at
- 2 the warehouse or even filled at the warehouse and
- 3 shipped? Had you lost control of the order?
- 4 A. Because, as stated earlier, Giant Eagle
- distributed to itself, we were our customer, we
- 6 knew everything about the characteristics of our
- 7 store and had control of and control of the
- 8 product from where it entered into the DC till it
- 9 left in a prescription for an end user patient.
- 10 If something needed to be quarantined and
- 11 removed from dispensing stock, we had the ability
- 12 to have our stores pull that aside, if necessary,
- 13 to prevent it from being dispensed.
- 14 O. You talked about a visit to Purdue that
- 15 you made in order to see their practices. Why did
- 16 Giant Eagle visit Purdue?
- 17 A. It was a conference call. It was a
- 18 conference call that we had. And I believe Purdue
- 19 reached out to us through the purchasing group,
- 20 put in contact with me for George and I to have a
- 21 conference call, again, along the lines of the
- 22 Thrifty White, for example.
- It was just another example of reaching out
- to determine what are some other things other
- organizations -- now Purdue being very different

- 1 from us as only a manufacturer and then a
- distributor to distributors, not dispensing.
- 3 It was essentially used as intel or insight
- 4 as to what other organizations are doing so we can
- 5 continue, as I had spoken repeatedly, improve and
- 6 evolve and tighten our practices.
- 7 Q. You said Purdue was very different from
- 8 you. Can you elaborate on that?
- 9 A. Purdue is a maker of brand -- well, most
- 10 known for Oxycontin. We mentioned earlier
- 11 Hysingla, which was in an email. And they are a
- 12 manufacturer that has a worldwide presence.
- Q. They are not, as Giant Eagle is, a
- 14 regional or, rather, as HBC is a regional
- 15 distributor to captive pharmacy purchasers?
- 16 A. No. They are not a regional distributor
- 17 for captive pharmacies.
- Q. Or a captive orderer, rather.
- 19 A. Exactly. The companies are very
- 20 different.
- Q. You also mentioned one of the things
- 22 that you found interesting at Purdue was that they
- were tracking the percentage of cash purchases.
- 24 Do you recall that?
- 25 A. I do.

- 1 Q. And opposing counsel asked about whether
- 2 you knew or whether that was something that Giant
- 3 Eagle did not do. Do you recall that?
- 4 A. I do.
- 5 Q. To clarify the record at all, was there
- 6 any point at which Giant Eagle was able to do that
- 7 kind of tracking and that kind of investigation?
- 8 A. So as I had mentioned, Jason Mullen and
- 9 the Supply Logics tool, the Supply Logics and I
- 10 believe -- one that was involved in the dispensing
- 11 patterns, Jason, his job was to go in and
- investigate, to parse the data, and had the
- ability to break it down via what the industry and
- 14 the DEA have defined as red flags to determine,
- and one of those being percentage of cash
- 16 prescriptions for target chemical entities like
- the oxycodone or hydrocodone and
- 18 hydrocodone-containing products, which by this
- 19 time rescheduled.
- So yes, he absolutely had the ability to
- 21 review that data and to present to us information.
- 22 O. And he would preemptively review that
- 23 data, or would he be responding to orders? What
- 24 was Jason Mullen doing?
- 25 A. The great thing about having the tool

- and having somebody dedicated to use it is they
- 2 could go on and they could dive into the data and
- 3 search for movement issues unprompted, so not
- 4 necessarily directed by intel from a store or a
- 5 movement pattern of an individual product.
- 6 And he could find -- he could look into that
- 7 and get as granular as creating geographical maps
- 8 of the patients and the doctors to help better
- 9 understand where those prescriptions were coming
- 10 from.
- 11 Q. Did this help you to preempt potential
- 12 orders of interest?
- 13 A. This did. It did help us prevent and
- 14 stop orders for stores, again, with buprenorphine.
- 15 Q. You mentioned that you attended a DEA
- 16 conference in 2013. Do you recall that?
- 17 A. I do.
- 18 Q. At that conference, do you recall any
- discussions at all about having written policies
- in regard to suspicious order monitoring?
- 21 A. I do not.
- Q. Do you recall there being any discussion
- 23 at all about requirements to maintain documents of
- investigations pursuant to your policies?
- 25 A. I do not.

- 1 Q. Opposing counsel just asked you several
- 2 questions about if you had retained such documents
- or if you had had some kind of a retention policy
- 4 and a recording policy that recorded every single
- 5 investigation you conducted, it would make things
- 6 easier for him. Do you recall that?
- 7 A. I do recall that.
- Q. We do, however, have the reports that
- 9 you referred to as the Voelker reports that are
- daily reports, and those show every single order
- 11 that was flagged. Is that accurate?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- Q. By the Voelker system, not by the other
- 14 controls that we have in place, but by the Voelker
- 15 system, does that show everything that was
- 16 flagged?
- 17 A. Correct, based on the thresholds.
- 18 Q. And there were over a thousand reports
- 19 produced from that system; is that correct?
- 20 A. To be honest, I don't know an
- 21 accumulated number.
- Q. Well, those came out daily from the
- period which it started until the end of your
- tenure at Giant Eagle; correct?
- MR. HUDSON: Object to form.